

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments recited above. The amendments have been made in response to the Examiner's allowance of previous claim 2. The remaining claims incorporate the limitation of previous claim 2. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14 and 22-25 are amended. Claims 2, 8, 10 and 17-19 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16 and 20-25 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 3-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,035,121 issued to Chiu et al. (hereinafter "Chiu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,634,114 issued to Shipley (hereinafter "Shipley"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to recite a method comprising the steps of "storing a computer application program in a first logical directory of one or more computer-readable media" and "storing a first version of a shared component in the first logical directory for execution with the computer application program on a computer system that stores at least a second version of the shared component in a second logical directory of the one or more computer-readable media, wherein the first component is a functional component of the computer application program that is compatible therewith." (Amendment emphasized).

Furthermore, "the computer application program is configured to use the first version of the shared component and not the second version of the shared component when the computer application program is executed on the computer system."

1 Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate certain limitations of previous
2 claim 2, now canceled, which was not rejected by the Office - only objected to as
3 depending from a rejected independent claim.

4 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection
5 thereof should be withdrawn.

6 Claim 2 has been canceled.

7 Claim 3 has been amended and now depends from claim 1. Claim 3,
8 therefore, is allowable at least by virtue of that dependency and the rejection
9 should be withdrawn.

10 Claim 4 has been amended to recite one or more computer readable media
11 that store computer-executable instructions for performing the steps of "storing an
12 application in a first directory of a computer system," "storing a local version of a
13 shared program component in the first directory" and "installing a file that
14 indicates to the application that the application should utilize the local version of
15 the shared program component without regard for a second version of a shared
16 program component stored in a second directory of the computer system."
17 (Amendment emphasized).

18 Claim 4 also recited that "the local version of the shared component is a
19 functional component of the application that is compatible therewith."

20 As amended, claim 4 is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly,
21 the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

22 Claim 5 has been amended to recite a method comprising the steps of
23 "calling a shared component in a computer system," "detecting a local file that
24 indicates the presence of a locally-stored version of the shared component, the
25 local file being a different file than the shared component itself" and "in response

1 to detecting the local file, utilizing the locally-stored version of the shared
2 component **that is stored in a first directory of the computer system** instead of a
3 global version of the shared component present in a **second directory of the**
4 computer system.” (Amendment emphasized).

5 Claim 5 now includes the allowable subject matter contained in previous
6 claim 2, now canceled. Therefore, claim 5 is allowable over the cited references
7 and the rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

8 Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5 and are allowable at least by virtue of
9 that dependency. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

10 Claim 8 is canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

11 Claim 9 has been amended and now recites one or more computer-readable
12 media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on the
13 computer, perform the following steps: “storing a computer application program in
14 a **first directory of a computer system that maintains a multiple-level directory**
15 **structure**” and “storing a first version of a shared component in the **first**
16 **directory for execution with the computer application program** on the
17 computer system, the computer system storing at least a second version of the
18 shared component in a **second directly of the computer system.**” (Amendment
19 emphasized).

20 Furthermore, according to claim 9, “the computer application program is
21 configured to utilize the first version of the shared component and not the second
22 version of the shared component when the computer application program is
23 executed on the computer.”
24
25

1 **Claim 9** now recites the limitations found to be allowable in previous claim
2 2. Therefore, claim 9 is allowable over the cited references and the rejection
3 thereof should be withdrawn.

4 **Claim 10** is canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof moot.

5 **Claims 11-13** depend from claim 9 and are allowable at least by virtue of
6 that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

7 **Claim 14** has been amended and now recites a computer system that
8 includes "memory divided into a plurality of discrete memory partitions," "an
9 application program stored in a first memory partition," "a first version of a shared
10 component stored in the first memory partition, the first version of the shared
11 component useable by the application program," "a second version of the shared
12 component stored in a second memory partition" and "an indicator stored in the
13 first memory partition that, when present, indicates the existence of the first
14 version of the shared component in the first memory partition."

15 Furthermore, "the application utilizes the first version of the shared
16 component if the indicator is present."

17 **Claim 14**, as amended, includes the elements found allowable in previous
18 claim 2. Particularly, an application and a first version of a shared component are
19 stored in a first memory partition and a second version of the shared component is
20 stored in a second memory partition. The presence of an indicator stored in the
21 first memory partition informs the application that the first version of the shared
22 component is stored in the first memory partition. So identified, the first version
23 of the shared component is used by the application and the second version of the
24 shared component is ignored.

1 Accordingly, claim 14 is allowable over the cited references and the
2 rejection thereof should be withdrawn.

3 Claims 15-16 depend from claim 14 and are allowable at least by virtue of
4 that dependency. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be withdrawn.

5 Claims 17-19 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection thereof
6 moot.

7 Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 14 and are allowable at least by
8 virtue of that dependency. The rejection of these claims, therefore, should be
9 withdrawn

10 Claim 22 has been amended to recite one or more computer-readable media
11 containing "a directory tree data structure having multiple directories." The
12 directory tree structure of the computer-readable media include "a first directory
13 that contains a pointer to a first version of a shared component useable by a
14 plurality of computer programs" and "a second directory that contains a pointer to
15 an application program and a pointer to a second version of the shared
16 component."

17 The application program "utilizes the second version of the shared
18 component when the application program calls the shared component."

19 The amendment to claim 22 adds limitations found to be allowable in
20 previous claim 2. Therefore, claim 22 is allowable over the cited references and
21 the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn.


22 Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are allowable at least by virtue of
23 that dependency. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.
24
25

Conclusion

All pending claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-16 and 20-25 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: DEC 22, 2003

By:  for
James R. Banowsky
Reg. No. 37,773
(509) 324-9256x216

DAVID A. MORAN
42905